

Comment on “Torque or no torque? Simple charged particle motion observed in different inertial frames,” by J. D. Jackson [Am. J. Phys. **72 (12), 1484-1487 (2004)]**

In this paper it is shown that the real cause of the apparent electrodynamic paradox discussed by Jackson [J. D. Jackson, Am. J. Phys. **72**, 1484 (2004)] is the use of three-dimensional (3D) quantities $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{F}$, $\mathbf{L}$, $\mathbf{N}$, When *4D geometric quantities* are used then there is no paradox and the principle of relativity is naturally satisfied.

In a recent paper in this Journal Jackson¹ discussed the apparent paradox of different mechanical equations for force and torque governing the motion of a charged particle in different inertial frames. Two inertial frames S (the laboratory frame) and S' (the moving frame) are considered (they are K and K' respectively in Jackson's notation). In S' a particle of charge q and mass m experiences only the radially directed electric force caused by a point charge Q fixed permanently at the origin. Consequently both $\mathbf{L}'$ and the torque $\mathbf{N}'$ are zero in S' , see Fig. 1(a) in Ref. 1. (The vectors in the three-dimensional (3D) space will be designated in bold-face.) In S the charge Q is in uniform motion and it produces *both* an electric field $\mathbf{E}$ and a *magnetic field* $\mathbf{B}$. The existence of $\mathbf{B}$ in S is responsible for the existence of the 3D magnetic force $\mathbf{F} = q\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{B}$ and this force provides a 3D torque $\mathbf{N}$ ($\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{F}$) on the charged particle, see Fig. 1(b) in Ref. 1. Consequently a nonvanishing angular momentum of the charged particle changes in time in S , $\mathbf{N} = d\mathbf{L}/dt$. Here we repeat Jackson's words¹ about such result: “How can there be a torque and so a time rate of change of angular momentum in one inertial frame, but no angular momentum and no torque in another? Is there a paradox? Some experienced readers will see that there is no paradox - *that is just the way things are, ...*” (my emphasis) Such reasoning is considered to be correct by many physicists. However in the considered case *the principle of relativity is violated* and the “explanation” of the type “*that is just the way things are*” does not remove the violation of the principle of relativity.

In this Comment it will be shown that - *it is not the way things are*, but that there is a simple solution of the above problem which is in a complete accordance with the principle of relativity. The real cause of the paradox is - *the use of 3D quantities*, e.g., $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{F}$, $\mathbf{L}$, $\mathbf{N}$, *their transformations and equations with them*. Instead of using 3D quantities we shall deal from the outset with *4D geometric quantities and equations with them*. In such treatment the paradox does not appear and the principle of relativity is naturally satisfied. The whole consideration is presented in much more details in Ref. 2 in which the resolution of the paradox is exposed in four different ways, whereas for this Comment we choose only one of them. There (Ref. 2) we have also discussed the Trouton-Noble experiment in which exactly the same paradox appears. It was shown² that the approach with 4D geometric quantities is in a complete agreement with experiment.

This investigation will be done in the geometric algebra formalism, which is recently nicely presented in this Journal by Hestenes.³ Physical quantities will be represented by geometric 4D quantities, multivectors that are defined without reference frames, i.e., as absolute quantities (AQs) or, when some basis has been introduced, they are represented as 4D coordinate-based geometric quantities (CBGQs) comprising both components and a basis. For simplicity and for easier understanding only the standard basis $\{\gamma_\mu; 0, 1, 2, 3\}$ of orthonormal 1-vectors, with timelike vector γ_0 in the forward light cone, will be used. For all mathematical details regarding the spacetime algebra reader can consult Hestenes' paper.³

Let us start the resolution of the paradox discussed by Jackson¹ writing all quantities as 4D AQs. The equations with them will be *manifestly Lorentz invariant* equations. Thus the position 1-vector in the 4D spacetime is x . Then $x = x(\tau)$ determines the history of a particle with proper time τ and proper velocity $u = dx/d\tau$. The Lorentz force as a 4D AQ (1-vector) is $K_L = (q/c)F \cdot u$, where u is the velocity 1-vector of a charge q (it is defined to be the tangent to its world line).

The bivector field $F(x)$ (i.e., the electromagnetic field $F(x)$) for a charge Q with constant velocity u_Q (1-vector) is

$$F(x) = kQ(x \wedge (u_Q/c)) / |x \wedge (u_Q/c)|^3, \quad (1)$$

where $k = 1/4\pi\epsilon_0$, see Ref. 2 and my references therein. (For the charge Q at rest, $u_Q/c = \gamma_0$.) All AQs in Eq. (1) can be written as CBGQs in some basis. We shall write them in the standard basis $\{\gamma_\mu\}$. In the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis $x = x^\mu \gamma_\mu$, $u_Q = u_Q^\mu \gamma_\mu$, $F = (1/2)F^{\alpha\beta} \gamma_\alpha \wedge \gamma_\beta$; the basis components $F^{\alpha\beta}$ are determined as $F^{\alpha\beta} = \gamma^\beta \cdot (\gamma^\alpha \cdot F) = (\gamma^\beta \wedge \gamma^\alpha) \cdot F$. In Hestenes' paper³ the spacetime split is used for the decomposition of F into the electric and magnetic fields that are represented by bivectors, see Eqs. (58)-(60) in Ref. 3. This means that Hestenes' decomposition is *an observer dependent decomposition*; an observer independent quantity F is decomposed into *observer dependent* bivectors of the electric and magnetic fields.

Instead of using the *observer dependent decomposition* from Ref. 3 we shall make an analogy with the tensor formalism⁴ and represent the electric and magnetic fields by 1-vectors E and B that are defined without reference frames, i.e., as AQs. Thence they are *independent of the chosen reference frame and of the chosen system of coordinates in it*.

$$\begin{aligned} F &= (1/c)E \wedge v + (IB) \cdot v, \\ E &= (1/c)F \cdot v, \quad B = -(1/c^2)I(F \wedge v), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where I is the unit pseudoscalar. (I is defined algebraically without introducing any reference frame, as in Ref. 5, Sec. 1.2.) The velocity v and all other quantities entering into the relations (2) are AQs. That velocity v characterizes some general observer. We can say, as in tensor formalism,⁴ that v is the velocity (1-vector) of a family of observers who measures E and B fields. Of course *the*

relations for E and B , Eq. (2) hold for any observer; they are manifestly Lorentz invariant equations. Note that $E \cdot v = B \cdot v = 0$, which yields that only three components of E and three components of B are independent quantities.

The 1-vectors E and B for a charge Q moving with constant velocity u_Q can be determined from (2) and the expression for the bivector field F (1). They are

$$\begin{aligned} E &= (D/c^2)[(u_Q \cdot v)x - (x \cdot v)u_Q] \\ B &= (-D/c^3)I(x \wedge u_Q \wedge v), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $D = kQ/|x \wedge (u_Q/c)|^3$. When the world lines of the observer and the charge Q coincide, $u_Q = v$, then (3) yields that $B = 0$ and only an electric field (Coulomb field) remains.

The Lorentz force as a 4D AQ $K_L = (q/c)F \cdot u$ can be written in terms of 4D AQs 1-vectors E and B as

$$K_L = (q/c)[(1/c)E \wedge v + (IB) \cdot v] \cdot u. \quad (4)$$

The equivalent expression in the tensor formalism, *with tensors as AQs*, is recently given in this Journal, Ref. 4. Particularly from the definition of the Lorentz force K_L and the relation $E = (1/c)F \cdot v$ (from (2)) it follows that the Lorentz force ascribed by an observer comoving with a charge, $u = v$, is *purely electric* $K_L = qE$. When K_L is written as a CBGQ in S and in the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis it is given as

$$K_L = (q/c^2)[(v^\nu u_\nu)E^\mu + \tilde{\varepsilon}^\mu_{\nu\rho}u^\nu cB^\rho - (E^\nu u_\nu)v^\mu]\gamma_\mu, \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\nu\rho} \equiv \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho}v^\lambda$ is the totally skew-symmetric Levi-Civita pseudotensor induced on the hypersurface orthogonal to v .

Further the angular momentum M (bivector), the torque N (bivector) for the Lorentz force K_L and manifestly Lorentz invariant equation connecting M and N are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} M &= x \wedge p, \quad p = mu, \\ N &= x \wedge K_L; \quad N = dM/d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

When M and N are written as CBGQs in the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis they become

$$\begin{aligned} M &= (1/2)M^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu, \quad M^{\mu\nu} = m(x^\mu u^\nu - x^\nu u^\mu), \\ N &= (1/2)N^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu, \quad N^{\mu\nu} = x^\mu K_L^\nu - x^\nu K_L^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We see that the components $M^{\mu\nu}$ from (7) are identical to the covariant angular momentum four-tensor given by Eq. (A3) in Jackson's paper.¹ However M and N from (6) are 4D geometric quantities, the 4D AQs, which are *independent of the chosen reference frame and of the chosen system of coordinates in it*, whereas the components $M^{\mu\nu}$ and $N^{\mu\nu}$ that are used in the usual covariant approach, e.g., Eq. (A3) in Ref. 1, are coordinate quantities, the numbers

obtained in the specific system of coordinates, i.e., in the $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ basis. Notice that, in contrast to the usual covariant approach, M and N from (7) are also 4D geometric quantities, the 4D CBGQs, which contain both components *and a basis*, here bivector basis $\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu$.

Let us now assume that the laboratory frame S is the γ_0 -system. Thus in S the observers who measure the fields are at rest, i.e., $v = v^\mu \gamma_\mu = c\gamma_0$, $v^\mu = (c, 0, 0, 0)$. Then from (2) it follows that in S the temporal components of the 4D E and B are zero and only their spatial components remain. In the laboratory frame S both charges Q and q are moving and the components in the CBGQs $u_Q^\mu \gamma_\mu$ and $u^\mu \gamma_\mu$ are given as $u_Q^\mu = u^\mu = (\gamma c, \gamma \beta c, 0, 0)$. The fields E and B as AQs are given by (3) and when they are written as CBGQs in S then the components E^μ become $E^0 = E^3 = 0$, $E^1 = D\gamma(x^1 - \beta x^0)$, $E^2 = D\gamma x^2$. Taking into account that in S' $t' = 0$, i.e., $x'^0 = \gamma(x^0 - \beta x^1) = 0$, the relation $x^0 = \beta x^1$ is obtained. Inserting this last relations into expressions for E^μ we find

$$E^0 = E^3 = 0, \quad E^1 = Dx^1/\gamma, \quad E^2 = D\gamma x^2. \quad (8)$$

The charge Q moves in the S frame, which yields that the magnetic field $B = B^\mu \gamma_\mu$ is now different from zero. The components B^μ are

$$B^0 = B^1 = B^2 = 0, \quad B^3 = (1/c)D\gamma\beta x^2 = \beta E^2/c. \quad (9)$$

The spatial components E^i and B^i from (8) and (9) are the same as the usual expressions for the components of the 3D vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. Inserting (8) and (9) into (5) we find the expression for the Lorentz force K_L in the laboratory frame S . The components of K_L in S are

$$\begin{aligned} K_L^0 &= q\gamma\beta E^1, \quad K_L^1 = q\gamma E^1, \\ K_L^2 &= q\gamma(E^2 - \beta c B^3) = qE^2/\gamma, \quad K_L^3 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We see that in S , when it is the γ_0 -system in which the observers who measure the fields are at rest, $v = c\gamma_0$, there is the 4D magnetic field (9) which enters into the expression for the total 4D Lorentz force K_L . Then using (8), (9), (10) and the relation $x^0 = \beta x^1$ one easily finds that all components $N^{\mu\nu}$ are zero

$$\begin{aligned} x^3 &= 0, \quad K_L^3 = 0 \Rightarrow N^{03} = N^{13} = N^{23} = 0, \\ K_L^0 &= \beta K_L^1 \Rightarrow N^{01} = x^1(\beta K_L^1 - K_L^0) = 0, \\ K_L^1 &= qDx^1, \quad K_L^2 = qDx^2 \Rightarrow N^{02} = N^{12} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Thus although in S there is the 4D magnetic field (9) and there is a part of K_L (in K_L^2 in (10)), which corresponds to the magnetic force, it is obtained that all components $N^{\mu\nu}$ are zero, $N^{\mu\nu} = 0$, and consequently the whole torque $N = (1/2)N^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu = 0$. Every 4D CBGQ is invariant upon the passive Lorentz transformations; the components transform by the Lorentz transformations and the basis by the inverse Lorentz transformations leaving the whole CBGQ unchanged. The invariance of some 4D CBGQ upon the passive Lorentz transformations reflects the fact that such mathematical, invariant, geometric

4D quantity represents *the same physical object* for relatively moving observers. Due to the invariance of any 4D CBGQ upon the passive Lorentz transformations N will be zero in all other relatively moving inertial frames, thus in S' , as well

$$N = (1/2)N^{\mu\nu}\gamma_\mu \wedge \gamma_\nu = (1/2)N'^{\mu\nu}\gamma'_\mu \wedge \gamma'_\nu = 0. \quad (12)$$

The paradox does not appear since the principle of relativity is automatically satisfied in such an approach to special relativity which exclusively deals with 4D geometric quantities, i.e., AQs or CBGQs, whereas in the standard approach to special relativity⁶ the principle of relativity is postulated outside the framework of a mathematical formulation of the theory.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this proof that N is zero in all relatively moving inertial frames is that the real cause of the violation of the principle of relativity and of the existence of the paradox is the use of 3D quantities as physical quantities in the 4D spacetime.

In the geometric approach to special relativity *the independent physical reality, both theoretically and experimentally, is attributed only to the 4D geometric quantities, AQs or CBGQs, and not, as usual, to the 3D quantities.* In Ref. 1 even the covariant quantities, e.g., $M^{\mu\nu}$, x^μ , u^ν , $F^{\alpha\beta}$, etc. are considered as auxiliary mathematical quantities from which “physical” 3D quantities are deduced.

It is worth noting that the comparison⁷ with well-known experiments that test special relativity as are the Michelson-Morley experiment, the “muon” experiments, the Kennedy-Thorndike type experiments and the Ives-Stilwell type experiments explicitly shows that all these experiments are in a complete agreement with such an approach with 4D geometric quantities, whereas, contrary to the general belief, it is not the case for the usual approach that deals with, e.g., the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time; the spatial distances and temporal distances taken separately are not well-defined quantities in the 4D spacetime.

REFERENCES

- ¹J.D. Jackson, “Torque or no torque? Simple charged particle motion observed in different inertial frames,” Am. J. Phys. **72**, 1484-1487 (2004).
- ²T. Ivezić, “Torque or no torque?! The resolution of the paradox using 4D geometric quantities with the explanation of the Trouton-Noble experiment,” physics/0505013; submitted to a research journal.
- ³D. Hestenes, “Spacetime physics with geometric algebra,” Am. J Phys. **71**, 691-714 (2003).
- ⁴D.A. T. Vanzella, G.E.A. Matsas, H.W. Crater, “Comment on “General covariance, the Lorentz force, and Maxwell equations,” by H. W. Crater [Am. J. Phys. **62** (10), 923-931 (1994)],” Am. J. Phys. **64**, 1075-76 (1996).
- ⁵D. Hestenes and G. Sobczyk, *Clifford Algebra to Geometric Calculus* (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1984).
- ⁶A. Einstein, “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper,” Ann. Physik. (Leipzig),

17, 891-921 (1905), tr. by W. Perrett and G.B. Jeffery, in *The Principle of Relativity*, (Dover, New York, 1952).

⁷T. Ivezić, “An invariant formulation of special relativity, or the “True transformations relativity,” and comparison with experiments,” *Found. Phys. Lett.* **15** 27-69 (2002);